1		REVISED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF
2		ANTHONY SANDONATO
3		ON BEHALF OF
4		THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF
5		DOCKET NO. 2019-290-WS
6		IN RE: APPLICATION OF BLUE GRANITE WATER COMPANY FOR
7		APPROVAL TO ADJUST RATE SCHEDULES AND INCREASE RATES
8		
9	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS, ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.
10	A.	My name is Anthony Sandonato. My business address is 1401 Main Street, Suite
11		900, Columbia, South Carolina, 29201. I am employed by the South Carolina Office of
12		Regulatory Staff ("ORS") in the Energy Operations Division as a Senior Regulatory
13		Manager.
14	Q.	DID YOU FILE DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS RELATED TO THIS
15		PROCEEDING?
16	A.	Yes. I filed direct testimony and eight (8) exhibits with the Public Service
17		Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") on January 23, 2020.
18	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
19	A.	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony
20		filed by Blue Granite Water Company ("BGWC" or "Company") witness DeStefano on
21		February 6, 2020. Specifically, I will focus on:
22		• The Company's proposed Annual Rate Adjustment ("ARA") mechanism;

1		 Cost of service and tariff rate design;
2		• Purchased water and sewer treatment expenses and related deferrals;
3		Amortization of deferral balances;
4		• Clarification for "Contributions in Aid of Construction ("CIAC") tariff
5		language;
6		• Costs related to processing of the Company's proposed ARA mechanism filing;
7		and
8		ORS's calculated rates and revenue requirement.
9	Annı	nal Rate Adjustment Mechanism
10	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN ORS'S POSITION WITH RESPECT TO THE COMPANY'S
11		PROPOSED ARA MECHANISM.
12	A.	ORS maintains the Company's ARA mechanism is not a "pass-through" of rates as
13		Company witness DeStefano refers to in his rebuttal testimony. The ARA mechanism is
14		designed by the Company to recover a significant expense with little to no review and
15		inadequate customer protections.
16	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED ARA MECHANISM
17		PASSES THROUGH TO CUSTOMERS A CHANGE IN EXPENSE VERSUS A
18		CHANGE IN RATES.
19	A.	As detailed in my Direct Testimony, the Company requests to "pass-through"
20		changes in purchased water and wastewater expenses. This is fundamentally different than
21		a "pass-through" of the change in purchased water and wastewater rates. For example, if a
22		third-party water provider increased the purchased water rate by \$0.05 per 1,000 gallons

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q.

Α.

Page 3 of 11 and the Company was billed for 100,000,000 gallons of water at the updated purchased water rate for the year, then the Company's total increase in purchased water expense would be \$5,000. For comparison purposes, the impact of this purchase water rate change if the customers' metered consumption totaled 75,000,000 gallons, would be an increase of \$3,750 for the year. According to the Company's proposed ARA mechanism, the increase would occur at the expense level and, therefore, there would be an allocation to customers resulting in them covering the \$3,750 attributed to the customer's consumption plus the additional \$1,250, which cannot be attributed to customer's consumption. This means the customer would be liable for the Company's total increase in expenses rather than liable for just the change in rates of the actual commodity. DOES THE ARA MECHANISM AS PROPOSED BY THE COMPANY EQUATE TO A DOLLAR-FOR-DOLLAR PASS-THROUGH IN RATES WITHOUT MARKUP OR MARGIN? No. The Company stated that the ARA mechanism allows the Company to track and pass on to customers changes in third party rates on a dollar-for-dollar basis without markup or margin. As illustrated above, this is not correct because the Company would

be passing on additional costs that could be attributed to non-revenue water or Inflow and Infiltration ("I&I") for purchased sewer treatment systems. Non-revenue water and I&I are appropriately reviewed in a general rate proceeding, and ORS has proposed an adjustment to the Company's purchased water deferral and purchased water expenses in this

¹ Rebuttal Testimony of Dante DeStefano Page 9, lines 7-11

	reorda	1 age 7 01 11
1		proceeding based on its review of the Company's purchased water expense and
2		management practices.
3	Q.	PLEASE RESPOND TO THE COMPANY'S ASSERTION THAT THE RATE
4		DESIGN PROPOSED IN THE ARA MECHANISM IS MORE COMPLEX THAN
5		THE PASS-THROUGH RATE CHANGES APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION
6		FOR KIAWAH ISLAND UTILITIES, INC. ("KIAWAH") OR OCEAN LAKES
7		UTILITIES, L.P. ("OCEAN LAKES").
8	A.	The Company acknowledges that its ARA mechanism rate design is not as simple
9		as Kiawah's or Ocean Lakes' due to BGWC purchasing water from fourteen (14) providers
10		and purchasing sewer treatment from eight (8) providers. A complicated rate design does
11		not justify shifting the risk to customers of all expenses incurred from a third-party
12		provider's rate increase. Water and sewer utilities in other states purchase water and sewer
13		treatment service from multiple sources and they are able to reflect third-party provider
14		rate increase specifically by water or sewer treatment provider. ^{2,3}
15	Q.	DOES ORS'S RECOMMENDATION TO REJECT THE ARA MECHANISM
16		UNFAIRLY IMPACT THE COMPANY?
17	A.	No. ORS's position offers protections to the Company's customers while
18		simultaneously allowing the Company an opportunity to recover increases in its expenses
19		from third-party vendors. This is the same treatment afforded to the Company for the

² Virginia-American Water Company Purchased Water Surcharge Ryder A https://dnnh3qht4.blob.core.windows.net/portals/14/Rates/VA%20Water%20Tariff.pdf?sr=b&si=DNNFileManager Policy&sig=%2BsuASTYJn20YfaMr0OwTPC8gfYO1grSXbRI5Y30Jluw%3D

³Maryland Water Service, Inc. Unaccounted-for-Water ("UFW") Reconciliation https://www.uiwater.com/docs/default-source/maryland/mws-tariff-water-2018-ufw-04-19-2019.pdf?sfvrsn=0

Q.

A.

Q.

A.

Page 5 of 11
recovery of other third-party expense increases such as increases in power, contract labor
and supplies. The Company is allowed to present increases and changes in operating
expenses in a general rate proceeding. During the general rate proceeding process, the
changes in all operating expenses are reviewed and may be adjusted. ORS's
recommendation to reject the ARA mechanism does not prohibit the Company from
seeking recovery of incurred third-party purchased water and wastewater expense.
CAN THE COMPANY MINIMIZE THE COST IMPACT OF THIRD-PARTY
WATER AND SEWER TREATMENT PROVIDERS?
Yes. The Company often negotiates contracts with third-party water and sewer
treatment providers. It is during this process that the Company would have an opportunity
to utilize its long-term strategic planning to negotiate rates and seek out additional
opportunities for potentially lower costs of purchased water and sewer treatment for its
customers.
DURING A GENERAL RATE CASE PROCEEDING, IS THE COMMISSION
LIMITED IN ITS ABILITY TO MAKE ADJUSTMENTS RELATED TO THE
COMPANY'S PURCHASED WATER AND PURCHASED SEWER TREATMENT
EXPENSES?
No. The Commission may incorporate adjustments to all Company operating
expenses in the determination and approval of rates and charges The fact that a municipal

No. The Commission may incorporate adjustments to all Company operating expenses in the determination and approval of rates and charges.. The fact that a municipal entity outside the jurisdiction of the Commission sets a rate for purchased water and sewer treatment expense does not constrain the Commission's determination of just and reasonable rates for the customers of BGWC.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

A.

1	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE ORS'S RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO THE
2		ARA MECHANISM.

ORS recommends the Commission deny the Company's request to establish an ARA mechanism. As detailed above, the Company's proposed ARA mechanism 1) does not contain consumer protections, and 2) disproportionally places risks such as non-revenue water on the Company's customers for Company-controlled expenses.

Alternatively, if the Commission determines the Company should recover its purchased water and sewer treatment charges more quickly than a general rate proceeding, ORS recommends that any rate that customers pay for purchased water and sewer treatment be established to reflect the actual rate from the third-party provider that provides the service to the customer.

Cost of Service and Tariff Rate Design

- Q. DOES THE COMPANY AGREE WITH ORS'S PROPOSAL TO LIMIT THE
 INCREASE TO WATER SERVICE TERRITORY 2 REVENUE REQUIREMENT
 TO NO MORE THAN 31% OF THE TOTAL WATER SERVICE REVENUE
 REQUIREMENT?
- 17 **A.** Yes. The Company agrees that continued rate consolidation is in the long-term best interest of its customers.⁴
- Q. WITNESS DESTEFANO ACKNOWLEDGES THAT THE COMPANY WOULD
 FILE A COST OF SERVICE STUDY IN ITS NEXT RATE CASE. PLEASE
 RESPOND TO THE COMPANY'S ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

⁴ Rebuttal Testimony of Dante DeStefano Page 37, lines 3-4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A.

	П	
	Г	
	ΪТ	1
	ڂ	١
	٠.	
	Ξ	1
	Ţ	J
	C	
	ž	
	<u> </u>	
		١
	Ÿ	,
	FLECITONICALLY	
	Η	
	_	
	_`	١
	т	
	Ξ	
	누	
	브	
		J
	ī	
	٧,	,
	34 0Z0Z	֡
	Σ.)
	$\ddot{}$)
	_	
	Ţ	1
	ወ	
	o	
	2	
	ᇬ	
	亏	
•	<	
	V.)
	4	
	Ų.	ĺ
	نب	
	4	
	_	
	_	
		-
	≤	
	≤	
	≤ '	
	≤ - \S	
	≤ - K.C.	
	≤ - V.C.T	
	<u> </u>	
	≤ - V.C.T.V.C	
	5:14 TM - VCTVC - U	
	≤ - CCTCC - DO	
	✓ - V.C.T.V.C LOCKE!	
	M - WCTWC - DOCKet →	
	M - VCTVC - DOCKet # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
	Jocket # 2019-2	
)ocket # 2019-290-WS -	
)ocket # 2019-290-WS -	
)ocket # 2019-290-WS -	
()ocket # 2019-290-WS -	
)ocket	
)ocket	
) ocket # 2019-290-WS - Page /	
	Jocket # 2019-290-WS - Page / of	
	Jocket # 2019-290-WS - Page / of	
	Jocket # 2019-290-WS - Page / of	
	Jocket # 2019-290-WS - Page / of	
	Jocket # 2019-290-WS - Page / of	

1	A.	A Cost of Service Study is essential to determine the proper rate design
2		Fundamentally, the Cost of Service Study will demonstrate which costs need to be
3		recovered and from which customer classes the cost should be recovered. Due to its
4		importance, ORS recommends the Commission require BGWC conduct a Cost of Service
5		Study that coincides with the test year and is included as part of its next rate case.
5	Q.	IS A COST OF SERVICE STUDY NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE

PURCHASED WATER OR SEWER TREATMENT CHARGE?

Yes. The proposed "Purchased Water Charge" and "Sewer Treatment Charge" are listed as separate line items on customer bills and are a component of BGWC's proposed ARA mechanism.

Until the Company completes a Cost of Service Study to identify the cost drivers, the Company cannot support a new rate design for water or sewer customers. ORS recommends the Commission require the Company conduct a Cost of Service Study prior to fundamentally changing its rate structure. The Commission has previously required significant rate design changes to be fully supported by relevant data prior to implementing the proposed changes.⁵ ORS believes that the Company should retain its existing rate structure of a Base Facility Charge, a commodity charge based on water consumption for water customers and a Base Facility Charge for sewer customers until the Company completes a Cost of Service Study.

DOES THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED ARA MECHANISM ALTER BASE Q. RATES?

⁵ Commission Order Nos. 2019-314 and 2019-323

Α.

A.

Yes. Company witness DeStefano states the proposed "Purchased Water
Adjustment Charge" and "Sewer Treatment Adjustment Charge" would be shown as a
separate line item on customer bills. ⁶ As discussed earlier, BGWC's proposal includes fan
allocation of expenses from third-party water and sewer treatment providers that
incorporate non-revenue water and I&I and other costs that are not directly related to the
rate increase from the third-party providers. Witness DeStefano indicates in Rebuttal
Testimony the Company is willing to provide a Cost of Service Study in its next base rate
filing to support changes in its rate structure. ORS agrees that a Cost of Service Study
should be complete before the Commission approves changes to the Base Facility Charges
for water and sewer service, commodity charges such as Distribution or the additional of
any new volumetric charge.

Q. PLEASE RESPOND TO WITNESS DESTEFANO'S ASSERTION THAT ORS RECOMMENDS THAT CHARGES BE "HIDDEN" WITHIN THE COMPANY'S RATE STRUCTURE.

The Company's current rate design approved by the Commission was recommended by the Company and classifies purchased water and sewer treatment costs as operating expenses which are allocated to all water and sewer customers. The Company's request to receive quicker recovery of purchased water and sewer treatment costs does not promote greater rate design transparency. Transparency does not result in the customer being assessed a rate that does not reflect the actual increase in an easily understood manner. Until the Company is able to provide customers the actual purchased

⁶ Rebuttal Testimony of Dante DeStefano Page 37, lines 14-15

22

Page 9 of 11
water or purchased sewer treatment expenses related to the services the customer receives
from the third-party provider, clarity and transparency will not be improved for the
customers.
Purchased Water and Sewer Treatment Expenses and Related Deferrals
IF THE COMMISSION DECIDES THAT THE COMPANY SHOULD CONTINUE
THE DEFERRALS TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN PURCHASED WATER
AND PURCHASED SEWER TREATMENT EXPENSES, SHOULD THE
COMPANY BE ALLOWED TO APPLY CARRYING COSTS TO THE
DEFERRALS AT THE COMPANY'S AUTHORIZED COST OF DEBT?
No. The Company's request to receive carrying costs in addition to recovery of the
deferral will impact customers negatively by increasing the amount to be recovered from
customers. Purchased water and sewer treatment expenses are similar to power, contract
labor and chemicals. The continuation of the deferral allows the Company the opportunity
to recover expenses outside of the historic test year. This benefit accrues to the Company
and is sufficient. The addition of carrying costs is not necessary nor does it benefit the
customer.
Amortization of Deferral Balances
PLEASE CLARIFY ORS'S PROPOSED AMORTIZATION PERIOD FOR
DECOMMISSIONING COSTS AND NET BOOK VALUE FOR THE
STONEGATE AND FRIARSGATE PLANTS.
ORS recommends that the amortization period of the Stonegate Water Treatment
Plant and associated decommissioning costs of \$742,071 reflect the amortization period of

1		water or purchased sewer treatment expenses related to the services the customer receives
2		from the third-party provider, clarity and transparency will not be improved for the
3		customers.
4		Purchased Water and Sewer Treatment Expenses and Related Deferrals
5	Q.	IF THE COMMISSION DECIDES THAT THE COMPANY SHOULD CONTINUE
6		THE DEFERRALS TO ACCOUNT FOR CHANGES IN PURCHASED WATER
7		AND PURCHASED SEWER TREATMENT EXPENSES, SHOULD THE
8		COMPANY BE ALLOWED TO APPLY CARRYING COSTS TO THE
9		DEFERRALS AT THE COMPANY'S AUTHORIZED COST OF DEBT?
10	A.	No. The Company's request to receive carrying costs in addition to recovery of the
11		deferral will impact customers negatively by increasing the amount to be recovered from
12		customers. Purchased water and sewer treatment expenses are similar to power, contract
13		labor and chemicals. The continuation of the deferral allows the Company the opportunity
14		to recover expenses outside of the historic test year. This benefit accrues to the Company
15		and is sufficient. The addition of carrying costs is not necessary nor does it benefit the
16		customer.
17		Amortization of Deferral Balances
18	Q.	PLEASE CLARIFY ORS'S PROPOSED AMORTIZATION PERIOD FOR
19		DECOMMISSIONING COSTS AND NET BOOK VALUE FOR THE
20		STONEGATE AND FRIARSGATE PLANTS.
21	A.	ORS recommends that the amortization period of the Stonegate Water Treatment

D.	10	c	11
Page	10	ΩŤ	11
I ugo	10	O1	1 1

calculated rates

1		the corresponding asset accounts. This results in an amortization period of 29.64 years.
2		ORS recommends that the Friarsgate Wastewater Treatment Plant and associated
3		decommissioning costs of \$7,006,490 reflect the amortization of the corresponding asset
4		accounts. This results in an amortization period of 31.12 years. ORS witness Briseno
5		details the calculation of the amortization periods in his surrebuttal testimony.
6		Clarification of CIAC Tariff Language
7	Q.	DOES ORS AGREE WITH THE COMPANY'S CLARIFICATION RELATED TO
8		CIAC AS DISCUSSED BY COMPANY WITNESS DESTEFANO ON PAGE 36 OF
9		HIS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
10	A.	Yes. ORS agrees it is appropriate to incorporate the authorized capital structure
11		from this rate case be utilized to calculate the tax gross up percentage on property
12		contributions.
13		Costs Related to Processing of the Company's Proposed ARA Mechanism Filing
14	Q.	SHOULD THE COMPANY BE ALLOWED TO RECOVER COSTS ASSOCIATED
15		WITH ITS PROPOSED ARA MECHANISM FILING?
16	A.	No. The Commission should reject the Company's proposed ARA mechanism as
17		filed and as a result the Company will not incur any administrative or legal expenses.
18		ORS's Calculated Rates and Revenue Requirement
19	Q.	PLEASE DETAIL ORS'S CALCULATED REVENUE REQUIREMENT BASED
20		ON INFORMATION CLARIFIED IN ITS SURREBUTTAL.
21	A.	Revised Surrebuttal Exhibit AMS-1 details the ORS calculated residential and
22		commercial water and wastewater service revenues, as adjusted, of \$32,489,546. ORS's

	Revise	d Surrebuttal Testimony of Anthony M. Sandonato Docket No. 2019-290-WS Blue Granite Water Company
	Februa	ry 24, 2020 Page 11 of 11
1		provide BGWC with an increase of \$3,829,858 or 31% for water operations and of
2		\$4,647,703 or 40% for sewer operations.
3	Q.	WILL YOU UPDATE YOUR TESTIMONY BASED ON INFORMATION THAT
4		BECOMES AVAILABLE?
5	A.	Yes. ORS fully reserves the right to revise its recommendations via supplemental
6		testimony should new information not previously provided by the Company, or other
7		sources, becomes available.
8	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
9	A.	Yes, it does.

Office of Regulatory Staff ORS Calculated Revenue

Blue Granite Water Company Docket No. 2019-290-WS

100 Met 110. 2017-270-113

ORS Calculated Revenue Summary - BGWC (Service Territory #1 and Service Territory #2)

% Increase 40% 40% 11% 21% 21% 40% 21% 40% 20% 40% 35% %9 $|\mathbf{T}|$ Calculated Rates Revenue at ORS \$16,032,218 \$32,510,816 \$16,331,727 \$9,305,747 \$2,002,159 \$4,748,568 \$6,873,342 \$1,431,603 \$7,780,244 \$122,615 \$299,510 \$93,900 ORS Calculated Test | Additional Revenue at **ORS** Calculated Rates \$4,647,703 \$2,222,785 \$2,641,308 \$1,188,550 \$4,597,964 \$8,477,562 \$830,780 \$409,274 \$350,345 \$49,739 \$9,249 \$7,425 Year Revenue \$11,684,024 \$11,434,254 \$24,033,254 \$1,022,329 \$5,557,459 \$6,664,438 \$3,917,788 \$1,651,814 \$5,684,791 \$115,189 \$249,770 \$84,650 Service Territory 1 & 2 - Sewer - Misc. Revenue Service Territory 2 - Water - Misc. Revenue **Fotal Water and Sewer Service Revenues** Service Territory 1 - Water - Misc. Revenue Service Territory 1 - Purchased Water Service Territory 2 - Purchased Water Operating Revenue **Fotal Service Territory 1 Water Fotal Service Territory 2 Water** Service Territory 2 - Well Water Service Territory 1 - Well Water Service Territory 1 & 2 - Sewer **Fotal Service Revenue Sewer**

В	C	D	E	Ŧ	G	Н
Customer Classification	Average Monthly Consumption per Customer *	Usage Charge per 1,000 gallons	Test Year End Customers ¹	Annualized Service Units	Base Facility Charge (BFC)	Test Year Revenue (F*D*C/1000) + (F*G)
400DWCOM 1" Durchage Water Commercial	12 561	\$10.57	v	09	07 653	\$11.110
	102,201	\$10.57	. —	12	\$104.80	\$11,110
400PWCOM - 2" Purchase Water Commercial	60,650	\$10.57	7	84	\$167.69	\$67,936
400PWCOM - 3" Purchase Water Commercial	108,723	\$10.57	1	12	\$314.43	\$17,564
400PWCOM - 3/4" Purchase Water Commercial	0	\$10.57	2	24	\$20.13	\$483
400PWCOM - 5/8" Purchase Water Commercial	7,336	\$10.57	20	240	\$20.13	\$23,441
400PWCRH - 1" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	12,212	\$10.57	41	492	\$52.40	\$89,289
400PWCRH - 1.5" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	35,220	\$10.57	38	456	\$104.80	\$217,546
400PWCRH - 2" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	66,720	\$10.57	43	516	\$167.69	\$450,427
400PWCRH - 3" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	121,237	\$10.57	5	09	\$314.43	\$95,754
400PWCRH - 3/4" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	4,500	\$10.57	22	264	\$20.13	\$17,871
400PWCRH - 4" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	107,190	\$10.57	3	36	\$524.19	\$59,658
400PWCRH - 5/8" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	6,137	\$10.57	101	1,212	\$20.13	\$103,018
400PWCRH - 8" Purchase Water Commercial - Riverhills	592,148	\$10.57	1	12	\$1,610.71	\$94,437
	3,302	\$10.57	88	1,056	\$20.13	\$58,114
400PWRES - 1.5" Purchase Water Residential	1,845	\$10.57	95	672	\$20.13	\$26,632
400PWRES - 2" Purchase Water Residential	2,957	\$10.57	93	1,116	\$20.13	\$57,346
400PWRES - 3/4" Purchase Water Residential	10,752	\$10.57	1	12	\$20.13	\$1,605
400PWRES - 4" Purchase Water Residential	665	\$10.57	16	192	\$20.13	\$5,081
400PWRES - 5/8" Purchase Water Residential	4,636	\$10.57	3,028	36,336	\$20.13	\$2,511,999
400PWRRH - Purchase Water Res - RH (All Meter Sizes)	4,610	\$10.57	4,683	56,196	\$20.13	\$3,869,527
400WCOM - 1" Commercial	611	\$7.83	1	12	\$52.40	989\$
400WCOM - 5/8" Commercial	866' <i>L</i>	\$7.83	7	84	\$20.13	\$6,951
400WCIR - Commercial Irrigation	30,295	\$10.57	16	192	00.0\$	\$61,482
400WRIR - Residential Irrigation	7,412	\$10.57	212	2,544	00.0\$	\$199,309
400WRES - Water Residential (All Meter Sizes)	4,716	\$7.83	1,545	18,540	\$20.13	\$1,057,823
402WRES - Water Residential (All Meter Sizes)	3,948	\$7.83	172	2,064	\$20.13	\$105,352
Woten Sarvice Total						\$0.211.847
Miscellaneous Revenues - Late Hees						432 372
						\$28.731
Min canconne changes						, C. (C. C. C
Miscellaneous Service Revenue						\$30
NSF Check & Reconnect Fee						\$32,760
Total Miscellaneous Revenues						\$93,900
Total Operating Revenues						\$9,305,747

¹ From Response to EO#1 Updated 1.4 x from wp.k

Office of Regulatory Staff ORS Calculated Revenuee

Blue Granite Water Company Docket No. 2019-290-WS

ORS Calculated Revenue at Current Rates - Service Territory 2

	ORS Calculated	Revenue at Current Rates - Service Territory 2	ice Territor		ş	7	}
\mathbf{A}	В	\mathbf{c}	D	E	F	G	H
	Customer Classification	Average Monthly Consumption per Customer ^x	Usage Charge per 1,000 gallons	Test Year End Customers ¹	Annualized Service Units	Base Facility Charge (BFC)	Test Year Revenue (F*D*C/1000) + (F*G)
	401WCOM - 5/8" Commercial Water Service	8,498	\$10.27	1	12	\$28.59	\$1,390
	401WCOM - 1" Commercial Water Service	1,006	\$10.27	2	24	\$79.59	\$2,158
	401WCOM - 1.5" Commercial Water Service	5,492	\$10.27		12	\$146.27	\$2,432
В	401WCOM - 3" Commercial Water Service	3,820	\$10.27	3	36	\$499.14	\$19,381
()	401WRES - Water Residential (All Meter Sizes)	3,880	\$10.27	4,641	55,692	\$28.59	\$3,811,427
L	401PWRFW - Foxwood Purchased Water	1,089	\$11.85	210	2,520	\$28.59	\$104,567
7	401WRPUR - 1" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	22,758	\$11.85	4	48	\$28.59	\$14,317
7 <u>N</u>	401WRPUR - 2" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	33,126	\$11.85	18	216	\$28.59	\$90,965
V	401WRPUR - 3/4" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	23,996	\$11.85	1	12	\$28.59	\$3,755
	401WRPUR - 5/8" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	3,640	\$11.85	1,671	20,052	\$28.59	\$1,438,210
	403WRES - Water Residential (All Meter Sizes)	4,685	\$10.27	88	1,056	\$28.59	\$81,000
	Water Service Total						\$5,569,602
	-						
	Miscellaneous Revenues - Late Fees						\$35,884
	New Customer Charges						\$21,985
	Miscellaneous Service Revenue						0\$
	NSF Check & Reconnect Fee						\$57,320
	Total Miscellaneous Revenues						\$115,189
	Total Operating Revenues						\$5,684,791

Office of Regulatory Staff **ORS** Calculated Revenuee

Blue Granite Water Company Docket No. 2019-290-WS

	Н	Test Year Revenue (F*D*C/1000) + (F*G)		\$1,684	\$2,611	\$2,952	\$22,464	\$4,620,676	\$126,898	\$17,332	\$110,110	\$4,546	\$1,743,273	\$98,181	\$6,750,727	\$43,310	\$21,985	80	\$57,320	\$122,615	\$6,873,342
	G	Base Facility Charge (BFC)	1	\$34.74	\$96.30	\$177.72	\$576.51	\$34.74	\$34.74	\$34.74	\$34.74	\$34.74	\$34.74	\$34.74							
	Ħ	Annualized Service Units		12	24	12	36	55,692	2,520	48	216	12	20,052	1,056							
	E	Test Year End Customers ¹	,	1	2	1	3	4,641	210	4	18	1	1,671	88							
Cerritory 2	D	Usage Charge per 1,000	0	\$12.43	\$12.43	\$12.43	\$12.43	\$12.43	\$14.34	\$14.34	\$14.34	\$14.34	\$14.34	\$12.43							
ORS Calculated Rates - Service Territory 2	C	Average Monthly Consumption per Customer *		8,498	1,006	5,492	3,820	3,880	1,089	22,758	33,126	23,996	3,640	4,685							
Revenue at ORS Calcul	B	Customer Classification	The same of the sa	401WCOM - 5/8" Commercial Water Service	401WCOM - 1" Commercial Water Service	401WCOM - 1.5" Commercial Water Service	401WCOM - 3" Commercial Water Service	401WRES - Water Residential (All Meter Sizes)	401PWRFW - Foxwood Purchased Water	401WRPUR - 1" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	401WRPUR - 2" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	401WRPUR - 3/4" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	401WRPUR - 5/8" Water Distribution and Purchased Water Charge	403WRES - Water Residential (All Meter Sizes)	Water Service Total	Miscellaneous Revenues - Late Fees	New Customer Charges	Miscellaneous Service Revenue	NSF Check & Reconnect Fee	Total Miscellaneous Revenues	Total Operating Revenues
	A						В	\mathbf{E}	IJ	\	₹ <u>/</u>	Λ									

¹ From Response to EO#1 Updated 1.4

x from wp.k

Revenue at ORS Calculated Rates - Service Territory 1 & 2

A	B	C	D	F	Ð
	Customer Classification	Test Year End Customers ¹	Annualized Service Units	BFC	Test Year Revenues (D*F)
	400WWCOM - WW Commercial (All Meter Sizes)	233	2,796	\$91.25	\$255,135
	400WWCRH - Commercial WW Treatment - RH (All Meter Sizes)	1,896	22,752	\$91.25	\$2,076,120
	400WWRCP - Residential WW Service (All Meter Sizes)	414	4,968	\$91.25	\$453,330
	400WWRES - WW Residential (All Meter Sizes)	6,171	74,052	\$91.25	\$6,757,245
	400WWRBJ - Residential WW Service (All Meter Sizes)	68	1,068	\$91.25	\$97,455
1	400WWRRH - Residential WW Treatment - YC (All Meter Sizes)	4,455	53,460	\$91.25	\$4,878,225
K	400WWRTC - Town of Chapin Purchase WW Res (All Meter Sizes)	88	1,056	\$91.25	\$96,360
E	400WWTRL - WW Trailer Residential (All Meter Sizes)	2	24	\$66.60	\$1,598
M	400WWTRT - Van Arsdale WW Treatment (All Meter Sizes)	2	24	\$47.48	\$1,140
Œ	400WWCCP - Commercial Wastewater Service (Richland County)	2	24	\$91.25	\$2,190
IS	400WWRHT - Riverhills WW Treatment (All Meter Sizes)	10	120	\$91.25	\$10,950
3	401WWRES - Residential WW Service (All Meter Sizes)	358	4,296	\$91.25	\$392,010
	401WWCOM - Commercial WW Treatment - (All Meter Sizes)	16	192	\$91.25	\$17,520
	403WWRES - Residential WW Service (All Meter Sizes)	593	7,116	\$91.25	\$649,335
	403WWMOB - Mobile Home Wastewater Service	174	2,088	\$66.60	\$139,061
	403WWVLG - Wastewater Residential Collection Charge	359	4,308	\$47.48	\$204,544
	Sewer Service Total		178,344		\$16,032,218
	Miscellaneous Revenues - Late Fees				\$110,969
	New Customer Charges				\$39,595
	Miscellaneous Service Revenue				\$131,066
	NSF Check & Reconnect Fee				\$17,880
	Total Miscellaneous Revenues				\$299,510
	Total Operating Revenues				\$16,331,727

¹ From Response to EO#1 Updated 1.4